

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 4-6 are pending in the present in application and are all independent claims. In the Final Office Action dated April 13, 2006, claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected. Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Final Office Action, including the Examiner's remarks. Claims 1 and 4-6 have been amended to more particularly recite and distinctly claims embodiments of the present invention. Claims 1 and 4-6 have not been amended in view of any prior art. Support for the subject matter added to claims 1 and 4-6 may be found throughout the specification and description, for example in FIG. 4. The above claim amendments, along with the following remarks, are believed to be fully responsive to the Final Office Action and all of the pending claims at issue are believed to be patentable. Therefore, allowance of the present application and all claims included herein is earnestly solicited.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging on page 3 of the outstanding Final Office Action that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in amended claims 1 and 4-6. At least in view of this acknowledgement, Applicants again point out that the above claim amendments do not raise any new issues.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for the time spent conducting a phone conference with Applicant's representative, Hermes M. Soyez, on September 12, 2006. The above claim amendments directly coincide with the proposed claim amendments discussed during the phone conference.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS - INFORMALITIES

Claims 1 and 4-6 were objected to because it was alleged that the phrase “wherein said first strainer chamber is defined by said housing and said second strainer chamber is detachably mounted to said housing” in the last paragraph of claims 1 and 4-6 was redundant of the limitations recited in the second and third paragraphs of the claims. The above amendment of claims 1 and 4-6 to delete the allegedly redundant phrase directly addresses the Examiner’s comments and renders the objection to claims 1 and 4-6 moot. At least for this reason, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1 and 4-6 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, it was alleged that these claims contained subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Even more specifically, it was alleged that the last 5 lines of claims 1 and 4-6 recited subject matter that lacked basis in the original specification and that was considered new matter.

Claims 1 and 4-6 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. More specifically, with respect to claims 1 and 4-6, it was alleged that it is unclear how the “duplex strainer” can provide a straining function since no elements for providing a straining function have been recited in those claims.

The above amendment of claims 1 and 4-6 directly addresses the Examiner's comments and renders the rejections of claims 1 and 4-6 under both 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, moot. At least for this reason, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 4-6 under both 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All of the outstanding objections and rejections have been addressed and overcome. Hence, at least in view of the foregoing claim amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in now condition for allowance. As such, allowance of the present application and all of the claims included therein is earnestly solicited. If it is believed that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

Docket No.: 87344.1524
Application No.: 10/621,317
Customer No. 30734

Special Examination Procedures
Amendment After Final
Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 87344.1524.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Hermes M. Soyez
Reg. No. 45,852

Date: September 13, 2006
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783